NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume 3, Issue No. 5 **A monthly newsletter** **November, 1997**

THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS REPORT
OF THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
UNITED STATES SENATE
NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

FEBRUARY 1982

PREFACE

To preserve liberty, it is essential that the whole body of the people always possess arms, and be taught alike, especially when young, how to use them." (Richard Henry Lee, Virginia delegate to the Continental Congress, initiator of the Declaration of Independence, and member of the first Senate, which passed the Bill of Rights.)

The great object is that every man be armed. Everyone who is able may have a gun." (Patrick Henry, in the Virginia Convention on the ratification of the Constitution.)

The advantage of being armed...the Americans possess over the peoples of all other nations. Notwithstanding the military establishments in the several Kingdoms of Europe, which are carried as far as the public resources will bear, the governments are afraid to trust the people with arms." (James Madison, author of the Bill of Rights, in the Federalist Papers, No. 26.)

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." (Second Amendment to the Constitution.)

In my studies as an attorney and as a United States Senator, I have constantly been amazed by the indifference or even hostility shown the Second Amendment by courts, legislatures, and commentators. James Madison would be startled to hear that his recognition of a right to keep and bear arms, which passed the House by a voice vote without objection and hardly a debate, has since been construed in but a single, and most ambiguous, Supreme Court decision, whereas his proposals for freedom of religion, which he made reluctantly out of fear that they would be rejected or narrowed beyond use, and those for freedom of assembly, which passed only after a lengthy and bitter debate, are the subject of scores of detailed and favorable decisions. Thomas Jefferson, who kept a veritable armory of pistols, rifles and shotguns at Monticello, and advised his nephew to forsake other sports in favor of hunting, would be astounded to hear supposed civil libertarians claim firearms ownership should be restricted. Samuel Adams, a handgun owner who pressed for an amendment stating that the "Constitution shall never be construed to prevent the people of the United States who are peaceable citizens from keeping their own arms," would be shocked to hear that his native state today imposes a year's sentence, without probation or parole, for carrying a firearm without a permit.

This is not to imply that the courts have totally ignored the impact of the Second Amendment in the Bill of Rights. No fewer than twenty-one decisions by courts of our states have recognized an individual right to keep and bear arms, and a majority of these have not only recognized the right but invalidated laws or regulations which abridged it. Yet in all too many instances, courts or commentators have sought, for reasons only tangentially related to constitutional history, to construe this right out of existence. They argue that the Second Amendment's words "right of the people" mean "a right of the state"--apparently overlooking the impact of those same words when used in the First and Fourth Amendments. The "rights of the people" to assemble or to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures are not contested as an individual guarantee. Still they ignore consistency and claim that the right to "bear arms" relates only to military uses. This not only violates a consistent constitutional reading of "right of the people" but also ignores that the second amendment protects a right to "keep" arms. These commentators contend instead that the amendment's preamble regarding the necessity of a "well regulated militia...to a free state" means that the right to keep and bear arms applies only to a National Guard. Such a reading fails to note that the Framers used the term "militia" to relate to every citizen capable of bearing arms, and that Congress has established the present National Guard under its power to raise armies, expressly stating that it was not doing so under its power to organize and arm the militia.

When the first Congress convened for the purpose of drafting a Bill of Rights, it delegated the task to James Madison. Madison did not write upon a blank tablet. Instead, he obtained a pamphlet listing the State proposals for a bill of rights and sought to produce a briefer version incorporating all the vital proposals of these. His purpose was to incorporate, not distinguish by technical changes, proposals such as that of the Pennsylvania minority, Sam Adams, or the New Hampshire delegates. Madison proposed among other rights that "That right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed; a well armed and well regulated militia being the best security of a free country; but no person religiously scrupulous of bearing arms shall be compelled to render military service in person." In the House, this was initially modified so that the militia clause came before the proposal recognizing the right. The proposals for the Bill of Rights were then trimmed in the interest of brevity. The conscientious objector clause was removed following objections by Elbridge Gerry, who complained that future Congresses might abuse the exemption to excuse everyone from military service.

The proposal finally passed the House in its present form: "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." In this form it was submitted

into the Senate, which passed it the following day. The Senate in the process indicated its intent that the right be an individual one, for private purposes, by rejecting an amendment which would have limited the keeping and bearing of arms to bearing "For the common defense".

The earliest American constitutional commentators concurred in giving this broad reading to the amendment. When St. George Tucker, later Chief Justice of the Virginia Supreme Court, in 1803 published an edition of Blackstone annotated to American law, he followed Blackstone's citation of the right of the subject "of having arms suitable to their condition and degree, and such as are allowed by law" with a citation to the Second Amendment, "And this without any qualification as to their condition or degree, as is the case in the British government." William Rawle's *View of the Constitution* published in Philadelphia in 1825 noted that under the Second Amendment: "The prohibition is general. No clause in the Constitution could be a rule of construction to be conceived to give to Congress a power to disarm the people. Such a flagitious attempt could only be made under some general pretense by a state legislature. But if in blind pursuit of inordinate power, either should attempt it, this amendment may be appealed to as a restraint on both. "The Jefferson papers in the Library of Congress show that both Tucker and Rawle were friends of, and corresponded with, Thomas Jefferson. Their views are those of contemporaries of Jefferson, Madison and others, and are entitled to special weight. A few years later, Joseph Story in his *Commentaries on the Constitution* considered the right to keep and bear arms as "the palladium of the liberties of the republic", which deterred tyranny and enabled the citizenry at large to overthrow it should it come to pass.

Subsequent legislation in the second Congress likewise supports the interpretation of the Second Amendment that creates an individual right. In the Militia Act of 1792, the second Congress defined "militia of the United States" to include almost every free adult male in the United States. These persons were obligated by law to possess a firearm and a minimum supply of ammunition and military equipment. This statute, incidentally, remained in effect into the early years of the present century as a legal requirement of gun ownership for most of the population of the United States. There can be little doubt from this that when the Congress and the people spoke of a "militia", they has reference to the traditional concept of the entire populace capable of bearing arms, and not to any formal group such as what is today called the National Guard. The purpose was to create an armed citizenry, which the political theorists at the time considered essential to word off tyranny. From this militia, appropriate measures might create a "well regulated militia" of individuals trained in their duties and responsibilities as citizens and owners of firearms.

If gun laws in fact worked, the sponsors of this type of legislation should have no difficulty drawing upon long lists of examples of crime rates reduced by such legislation. That they cannot do so after a century and a half of trying--that they must sweep under the rug the southern attempts at gun control in the 1870-1910 period, the northeastern attempts in the 1920-1939 period, the attempts at both Federal and State levels in 1965-1976--establishes the repeated, complete and inevitable failure of gun laws to control serious crime.

Immediately upon assuming chairmanship of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, I sponsored the report which follows as an effort to study, rather than ignore, the history of the controversy over the right to keep and bear arms. Utilizing the research capabilities of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, the resources of the Library of Congress, and the assistance of constitutional scholars such as Mary Kaaren Jolly, Steven Halbrook, and David T. Hardy, the subcommittee has managed to uncover information on the right to deep and bear arms which documents quite clearly its status as a major individual right of American citizens. We did not guess at the purpose of the British 1689 Declaration of Rights; we located the Journals of the House of Commons and private notes of the Declaration's sponsors, now dead for two centuries. We did not make suppositions as to colonial interpretations of the Declaration's right to keep arms; we examined colonial newspapers which discussed it. We did not speculate as to the intent of the framers of the second amendment; we examined James Madison's drafts for it, his hand written outlines of speeches upon the Bill of Rights, and discussions of the second amendment by early scholars who were personal friends of Madison, Jefferson, and Washington and wrote while these still lived. Shat the Subcommittee on the Constitution uncovered was clear--and longlost--proof that the second amendment to our Constitution was intended as an individual right of the American citizen to keep and carry arms in a peaceful manner, for protection of himself, his family, and his freedoms. The summary of our research and findings forms the first portion of this report.

In the interest of fairness and the presentation of a complete picture, we also invited groups which were likely to oppose this recognition of freedoms to submit their views. The statements of two associations who replied are reproduced here following the report of the Subcommittee. The Subcommittee also invited statements by Messrs. Halbrook and Hardy, and by the National Rifle Association, whose statements likewise follow our report.

When I became chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, I hoped that I would be able to assist in the protection of the constitutional rights of American citizens, rights which have too often been eroded in the belief that government could be relied upon for quick solutions to difficult problems.

Both as an American citizen and as a United States Senator I repudiate this view. I likewise repudiate the approach of those who believe to solve American problems you simply become something other than American. To my mind, the uniqueness of our free institutions, the fact that an American citizen can boast freedoms unknown in any other land, is all the more reason to resist any erosion of our individual rights. When our ancestors forged a land "conceived in liberty", they did so with musket and rifle. When they reacted to attempts to dissolve their free institutions, and established their identity as a free nation, they did so as a nation of armed freemen. When they sought to record forever a guarantee of their rights, they devoted one full amendment out of ten to nothing but the protection of their right to keep and bear arms against government interference. Under my chairmanship the Subcommittee on the Constitution will concern itself with a proper recognition of, and respect for, this right most valued by free men.

ORRIN G. HATCH
Subcommittee on the Commission
January 20, 1982

The right to keep and bear arms is a tradition with deep roots in American society. Thomas Jefferson proposed that "no free man shall ever be debarred the use of arms," and Samuel Adams called far an amendment banning any laws "to prevent the people of the United States who are peaceable citizens from keeping their own arms." The Constitution of the United States, for example, recognizes the "right of an individual citizen to bear arms in the defense of himself or the State."

Even though the tradition has deep roots, its application to modern America is the subject of intense controversy. Indeed, it is a controversy into which the Congress is beginning, once again, to immerse itself. I am personally disappointed that so important an issue should

"When spiritual death creeps through the land like poison gas, the school and its pupils are of course among the first to suffocate"

--Solzhenitsyn, *Gulag Apapelago* IV-VII, p. 429

have generally been so thinly researched and so minimally debated both in Congress and the courts. Our Supreme Court has but once touched on its meaning at the Federal level and that decision, now nearly half-century old, is so ambiguous that any school of thought can find some support in it. All Supreme Court decisions on the second amendment's application to the States came in the last century, when constitutional law was far different than it is today. As ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, I, therefore, welcome the effort which led to this report--a report based not only upon the independent research of the subcommittee staff, but also upon full and fair presentation of the cases by all interested groups and individual scholars.

I personally believe that it is necessary for the Congress to amend the Gun Control Act of 1968. I welcome the opportunity to introduce this discussion of how best these amendments might be made.

The Constitution subcommittee staff has prepared this monograph bringing together proponents of both sides of the debate over the 1969 Act. I believe that the statements contained herein present the arguments fairly and thoroughly. I commend Senator Hatch, chairman of the subcommittee, for having this excellent reference work prepared. I am sure that it will be of great assistance to the Congress as it debates the second amendment and considers legislation to amend the Gun Control Act.

Dennis DeConcini
Ranking Minority Member
January 20, 1982

Closing Note: The subcommittee report goes into the history of the Second Amendment and why each and every American citizen has an unalienable right to be armed. It makes for good reading and would certainly be well received by any militia group in the country. However, if the Constitution could speak for itself, it would probably quote Isaiah 29:13; "***...For as much as this people*** [Congress] ***draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do honor me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men.***" Legislation coming out of Congress isn't based on the dictates of the Constitution, but on *"the precepts of men."* In other words, Congress passes legislation based on what *they* think the Constitution *should* have said, or how *they* would have written the Constitution--not how it's actually written. Our judiciary interprets the Constitution much in the same manner.

You only need to look at the legislation passed since this subcommittee report: The assault weapon ban, the Brady Bill, and a host of other firearm and ammunition restriction proposals.

SPOUSAL ABUSE LAW HITS THE MILITARY

"The Pentagon is preparing to take firearms away from hundreds of military personnel who have been convicted of spousal abuse," UPI reported, September 29, 1997.

One Defense Department lawyer, who refused to be identified, said, ***"The legislation was a major problem for us. The ramifications were complicated and massive. A big part of the problem is that the wording of the law is pretty vague about how a firearm is defined."*** (If you're a member of a militia and find yourself in court on a weapons charge rest assured that the judge will explain it to you.)

The UPI report went on to say, ***"For that reason, officials had to consider whether the law would include fighter pilots, warship skippers and tank drivers; the lawyer doesn't believe that's the case. But pilots flying in conflict areas have to carry sidearms, and the lawyer said it's likely that aviators who've been convicted of spousal battery will be grounded."***

The press report concluded that grounded pilots will be given desk jobs. Only in America (today, anyway) would our government spend hundreds of thousands dollars to train a pilot and then ground him for having a fight with his spouse. The military must be thrilled about the two yahoos currently in the White House.

MURDER CHARGE AGAINST KEVIN HARRIS DROPPED

"A judge dismissed a state murder charge Thursday against a man who allegedly killed a federal agent in the 1992 Ruby Ridge shootout." reported an AP news release on October 2.

Magistrate Quentin Harden dropped the murder charge against Harris stating that it was in violation of state law to charge someone who had already faced the same charges in another "state, territory or country."

"To rule that the courts of the United States of America do not come under another state, territory, or country would be an anomalous result--giving more credence to the courts of another country than to the courts of our own nation," Harden wrote.

Harris has filed a ten million law suit against Lon Horiuchi over Ruby Ridge. Horiuchi told the Senate committee that he shot at Harris because he was shooting at an FBI helicopter. The fact of the matter is that Harris and Randy Weaver left the cabin to prepare Sammy Weaver's body for burial when Horiuchi fired at them.

It should also be noted that, according to Bo Gritz, Horiuchi has bragged about his shooting of Vickie Weaver to fellow FBI agents--and some of them are totally disgusted over his remarks and attitude. Wouldn't it be nice to have a few of them testify at the civil trial on Harris's behalf ? (Don't bet on it.)

The government has tried to block Harris from filing the law suit but to no avail. The L.A. Times reported, ***"In a unanimous decision written by Los Angeles Judge Stephen Reinhardt, the three judge panel of the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals said the special rules that led to the death of the wife of white separatist Randy Weaver and the wounding of their friend Kevin Harris "violated clearly established law, and any reasonable law enforcement officer should have been aware of that fact."***

When Harris was charged with murder he immediately surrendered himself to the authorities and released on a $10,000 bail; unheard of for a first degree murder charge. That amount is usually reserved for petty theft or minor drug possession charges. This is not the case for Lon Horiuchi who has been charged with man slaughter over the shooting of Vickie Weaver. Not only has Horiuchi not posted bail--he's no where to be found! Rumor has it that the FBI is actually hiding Horiuchi while trying to get the case moved out of state court in Idaho into a federal court. Why hasn't the state of Idaho issued a warrant for Horiuchi's arrest? Let a militiaman charged with manslaughter not show up for arraignment or a bail hearing and every FBI agent in the nation will be looking for him. Not so when it's one of their own.

"The events at Ruby Ridge have helped weaken the bond of trust between ordinary Americans and our law enforcement agencies," reported the Senate Judiciary Sub-committee on Terrorism after reviewing the FBI's conduct at Ruby Ridge. With the FBI hiding Horiuchi that "bond of trust" is weakened still further. Remember what Jefferson said in the *Preamble*? ***"For protecting them, by a mock trial, from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States."*** The FBI has gone a step further, not only do they deprive us of a mock trial, we don't get so much as a bail hearing!!! Things have gotten so bad with our government today that it may come to a point where we can look upon pre-Revolutionary British rule as "the good old days."

UZI IMPORTS IN TROUBLE

In our November Newsletter we reported that the BATF had given permission to Israel to reintroduce the Uzi to the American market. Whether they were going to be manufactured in the U.S. by Mossberg or imported directly from Israel is not clear. Whatever the case, Sen. Dianne Feinstein sent a petition signed by 30 Senators urging President Clinton to stop the importation of ***"tens of thousands of military-style assault weapons."***

MILITIA MOVEMENT GROWING

"Arizona militia leaders say there are overwhelmed by all the recruiting opportunities. Hardly a week goes by, they say, without some government abuse to remind people that Big Brother can't be trusted." So says the opening paragraph of an article appearing in The Arizona Republic by Mark Shaffer, 9/29/97.

Shaffer said that the recent revelations about the IRS and the creation of a national monument [land grab] in Utah are waking up many Americans to government abuse. Quoting Southern Poverty Law Center figures, the number of active militias two years ago stood at 224. Today it's up to 858, and the number keeps rising. "The ***militia movement in Arizona has grown tremendously since the Oklahoma City bombing. There's only 10 or 15 groups that talk about themselves but for every one of them there's dozens that don't and those are the ones that are growing rapidly,"*** said David D'Addabbo of Chino Valley, head of the Sons and daughters of Liberty.

"Another factor in the proliferation of these groups, D'Addabbo said, was the arrest last year of Viper Militia members. The federal government said at the time that it had broken a conspiracy to bomb federal buildings in Phoenix but members of the group were convicted only of weapons violations. That drove many militia groups, especially the newer ones, even further underground," Shaffer wrote.

"It's all part of the "leaderless-resistance" type of militias", D'Addabbo said, which seems to be popular in the southwest.

"They don't draw attention to themselves and the outings have much more of a family feel than a military organization. But I think they are very effective. Each person recruits five other people. In a time of crisis, I can count on 200 people immediately and we can have 25,000 people together in three hours," said Mike Johnson, a militia leader in Arizona.

"Militias are good because you want the government afraid of the people," said Steve Porack, spokesman for sovereign citizens Movement.

A FEW QUOTES FROM THE "TOLERANT" LEFT

The political left has always accused the right of be intolerant and bigoted towards the opinions of others. Here are a few notable quotes from the "tolerant" left:

"I dream of the hour when the last Congressman is strangled to death on the guts of the last preacher--and since the Christians love to sing about the blood, why not give them a little of it." Gus Hall, General Secretary of the Communist Party USA, February 1961.

"I also made it clear that Socialism means equality of income or nothing, and that under Socialism you would not be allowed to be poor. You would be forcibly fed, clothed, lodged, taught, and employed whether you like it or not. If it were discovered that you had not the character and industry enough to be worth all this trouble, you might possibly be executed in a kindly manner; but whilst you were permitted to live you would have to live well." George Bernard Shaw, *Intelligent Woman's Guide To Socialism*.

If any of our readers would care to explain to us how you execute someone in a "kindly manner," feel free to write us and explain because we don't have a clue. Only left-wing wackos would consider killing someone (i.e., genocide) who disagrees with their ideology as an act of ***"kindness."*** And they call this ***"living well?"***

JUDICIAL TYRANT

To those who have been receiving our Newsletter on a regular basis will remember the articles 'Government by Judiciary,' part I & II, explaining how our judiciary has usurped the Constitution via judicial supremacy.

After the recent demise of Judge William Brennan Jr., back in August, Jeff Jacoby of the *Boston Globe* wrote an article titled; *Brennan's Legacy As Judicial Authoritarian.* Here's an example of judicial despotism at it's very worst. Jacoby wrote:

He may have been a man of much charm, but William Brennan Jr., the former Supreme Court justice who died recently at 91, did more damage to America's machinery of self-government and to the judicial tradition of self-restraint than almost any other judge of our time.

Over the course of 34 years on the bench, Brennan repeatedly shoved aside text and precedent, trampling the rights of citizens and legislatures in order to chisel his own notions of justice into American law.

Thanks in great measure to Brennan's zealous activism, judicial nominations proceed today as bitter ideological battles, hundreds of jails and school systems have been taken over by judges, and successful ballot initiatives are routinely dismembered in court.

He taught judges, lawyers, and special-interest pleaders to regard the law--even the Constitution--as forever manipulable, always able to generate a desired result no matter what the law actually said or what the settled tradition required.

Brennan's chief legacy is neither his leftist philosophy nor his discrete opinions. It is his judicial authoritarianism: his assertion that in any political controversy, judges have the last word--not the voters, not lawmakers, not elected representatives.

In her absorbing 1994 book " A Nation Under Lawyers," Harvard law professor Mary Ann Glendon observes that when Learned Hand, the most eminent and respected federal judge of the first half of the 20th century, was asked about his judicial philosophy, he liked to say it was summed up in Oliver Cromwell's utterance before the battle of Dunbar: 'I beseech ye in the bowels of Christ, think that ye may be mistaken.' Those words, said Hand, should be inscribed on the portals of every courthouse in the nation.

Four decades later, shortly after his retirement, Brennan was asked whether there were any cases in which he had come to regret or doubt his decision.

Hell no," said Brennan, "I never thought I was wrong."

In less than a lifetime, the judicial mindset has journeyed from the humility of Learned Hand to the hubris of William Brennan. The change has not been for the better.

It would take a shelf of law reviews to analyze all of Brennan's 1,300-plus opinions. But for a taste of the stop-at-nothing hardball that typified his judging, consider just one: United States of America v. Weber.

In 1974, the Kaiser Aluminum plant in Gramercy, La., created nine on-the-job training slots for skilled craft positions, such as instrument repairman and electrician.

Brian Weber, a white employee with six years' seniority, applied to the training program.

But Kaiser and its union--under pressure from the Federal Contract Compliance Office to increase the number of black craftsmen--had installed a quota system: For every white applicant enrolled in the program, a black applicant would be enrolled, until the percentage of blacks in craft positions reached 39 percent--the ratio of blacks in the local work force.

As a result of the quota, Weber was rejected, while two less senior black applicants were admitted.

Weber sued, arguing that Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 barred Kaiser and the union from discriminating among employees on the basis of race. Indeed, Sec. 703 (d) of the law seemed to have been drafted with Weber's case in mind:

"It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee controlling apprenticeship or other training or retraining, including on-the-job training programs, to discriminate against any individual because of his race, color, religion, sex, or national origin in admission to, or employment in, any program established to provide apprenticeship of other training."

As if to drive the point home, another section of Title VII made it illegal to classify

workers "in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive an individual of employment opportunities...because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin."

Weber's case seemed open-and-shut. He won in US District Court, ad again in the Court of Appeals.

But in 1979, in an opinion written by Justice Brennan, the Supreme Court dismissed Weber's "literal construction" of Title VII.

True, the law's plain meaning prohibited hiring by race. But its "historical context" showed that Congress wanted to improve the plight of blacks.

"It would be ironic indeed," Brennan wrote, "if Title VII were to prevent race-conscious efforts to abolish traditional patterns of racial segregation."

In other words, a statute that flatly forbade race-based hiring was to be interpreted as permitting race-based hiring.

Brennan was in favor of quotas, and so, law or no law, quotas were going to be approved. It was that simple.

In a blistering dissent, Justice William Rehnquist quoted at length from the congressional debates over the Civil Rights Act.

Over and over, Title VII's proponents had insisted that the law could never be used to authorize hiring or firing on account of race.

The point was made dozens of times, but Senator Hubert Humphrey, chief architect of the Civil Rights Act, put it most memorably: "If anyone can find in Title VII," he declared, "any language which provides that an employer will have to hire on the basis of color, I will start eating the pages one after another, because it is not there."

But Brennan didn't care whether it was there or not. He was intent on grafting racial quotas and preferences onto affirmative action, and he got his way.

Steelworkers Vs. Weber threw open the gates to explicit reverse discrimination in the workplace. The consequences--18 years of turmoil, hostility, and racial tention--are with us still. (End of article.)

Closing note: It comes as no surprise that a judge would usurp the laws of the land through the principles of judicial supremacy. It happens all the time. What is surprising is the fact that Congress allowed it to continue for 34 years. Why wasn't Brennan impeached? Why did Congress allow it to continue for such a length of time? Brennan, and any other judge who thinks he's above the law, should be hammered, absolutely hammered, by Congress with impeachment. This would serve as a warning to other mini-dictators to tow the line.

OOPS...SORRY!

Elizabethtown, PA. ***Armed FBI trainees in bulletproof vests and camouflage surrounded a group of teenagers, handcuffed them and forced them to the ground before realizing they had the wrong people.***

The trainees were taking part in a training exercise at a town square Wednesday night in which there were apparently supposed to nab others taking part in the drill. Instead, up to 30 FBI trainees jumped out of a caravan of vehicles and descended on the innocent teen-agers, bound their wrists with plastic ties and ordered them to lie face down on the sidewalk. After about 30 minutes, the agents set the teens free.

The FBI would not comment on the specifics of the drill, but an FBI official apologized Friday and two agents visited the home of one of the youths Thursday night to express there regrets. --AP press.

GUN -VS- HOME SCHOOLS

BATF Director John Magaw informed Congressman Dan Coates by letter that the Gun-free School Zones Act, forbidding firearms within 1000 feet of a school, includes home schools as well.

'CREATING A NEW CIVILIZATION'

"The time has come for the next step forward in American politics. It is not a matter of Democrats and Republicans, or the left or right--but something more significant--a clear distinction between rear-guard politicians who wish to preserve or restore an unworkable past and those who are ready to transition to what we call a "Third Wave" information society. A new civilization is emerging in our lives, and blind men everywhere are trying to suppress it. This new civilization brings with it new family styles, changed ways, a new economy, new political conflicts, and, an altered consciousness. Humanity faces a quantum leap forward. This is the meaning of the Third Wave...globalization routinely punctures the national sovereignty the nationalists hold so dear. The Third Wave demassifies culture, values, and morality. There are more diverse religious systems. The Constitution of the United States needs to be reconsidered and altered, to create a whole new structure of government..the system that served us so well must, in its turn, die and be replaced."

The above quote is from the book *Creating a New Civilization* by Alvin and Heidi Toffier.

Not only does Newt Gingrich endorse this book--he wrote the foreword to it!!!

If this weren't enough to dampen your spirits, *PRNewswire* released a news report entitled: 'Changing The Way We Pay.'

"Cash and checks will become an endangered species," said Visa International CEO Edmund P. Jensen accompanied by six Visa regional presidents at a news conference.

"Demand for convenience, globalization and large new markets are driving technological advances to create new ways to pay. Chip cards, combined with the Internet, will transform the way we shop, allowing consumers to conduct safe electronic transactions anytime and anywhere in the world. And chip cards will literally put a bank in the consumer's pocket. In five years, more than one billion Visa cards will be in use and up to a third of those cards will be chip cards--and that's just the start," said Jensen.

Anyone who has read Apocalyptic prophecies in the Bible will soon realize that we are entering a dangerous period in our history.

IRS DIRTY LAUNDRY LIST

The following is a column written by Boston Globe Columnist, Jeff Jacoby, in response to an Ann Lander's kid-glove treatment of the IRS.

"How about the 3,000 people notified by the IRS in 1993 that they each owed $4 billion in back taxes?

How about the Philadelphia chemical firm that was penalized nearly $47,000 because the IRS determined that its tax payment of $4,448,112.88 was a dime short?

The IRS spent $8 billion to overhaul its computer programs. What it got for all that money, a top official admitted are systems that "do not work in the real world."

The federal tax agency sends out some 30 million tax penalty notices every year. Nearly half erroneous!

As the tax deadline approaches each year, the IRS invites taxpayers to call its toll-free number with questions. When they do call in, millions are given the wrong answers. When those callers rely on those wrong answers, they are slapped with interest, penalties and liens on their property. The Heritage Foundation complied nine pages of numbers underscoring IRS ineptitude. Here are a few examples:

The number of times the IRS gave the wrong answer in 1993 to taxpayers seeking assistance with their tax forms: 8.5 million.

The percentage of its own budget for which the IRS could not account in an audit: 64%.

The number of correction notices sent out by the IRS each year that turned out to be wrong: 5 million.

The number of women wrongly fined each year because they get divorced or remarried: 3 million.

The number of taxpayers whose old-age benefits that will be cut because the IRS doesn't properly record their tax payments: 10 million.

As the IRS Code grows ever more complex, it becomes easier for agents to find something wrong with any tax return. The existing tax code has become a source of unfathomable power for IRS agents--and that power corrupts. In a survey of IRS officials in 1991, three-forths said they would probably not be "completely

honest" if they had to testify before Congress. Nearly half admitted they would use their position to harass personal enemies.

MORE GUNS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

"A new report revealing that almost 60,000 federal employees now carry weapons has prompted the Libertarian Party to come out for gun control--for the federal government." This is the opening paragraph for a press release put out by the Lebertarian Party in Washington, D.C. These figures are based on the General Accounting Office report.

Steve Dashback, national chairman for the Libertarian Party said, ***"Federal employees have gone nuts--gun nuts. It's time to impose a waiting period on the federal government, while the American people conduct a background check on these armed and potentially dangerous bureaucrats."***

Federal employees who now carry weapons include poultry inspectors, park rangers, disaster aid workers, Small Business Administration, NASA, Department of Education, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and Department of Veterans Affairs. Also, The National Park Service and the Department of Health & Human Services have their own SWAT teams.

The report revealed that the Energy Department has access to machine guns and can summon tanks and military helicopters.

"Congress has passed over 3,000 criminal laws, and federal agencies have churned out hundreds of thousands of regulations that carry criminal penalties. The result is that ordinary Americans run a constant risk of violating laws they've never heard of as federal agents scramble to enforce those laws as the point of a gun. No wonder Americans don't trust their government; their government doesn't trust them. But trust doesn't grow out of the barrel of a gun--or from the sight of a pistol-packing poultry inspector." Dashback said.

"WITH GOD, ALL THINGS ARE POSSIBLE"

The above biblical quote is the State motto for Ohio--but not for long if the ACLU has its way. ***"The state is not supposed to pick a favorite religion,"*** said ACLU Executive Director Christine Link. Characteristically, the ACLU filed a lawsuit in U.S. District Court to try and force the state of Ohio to change its motto.

"Under the First Amendment of the Constitution, the government is supposed to be neutral and neither supportive nor hostile to religion. The state's promotion of Christianity in this manner violates that neutrality," said Link.

The true purpose of the First Amendment was to prevent the government from establishing a state religion--at the expense of all other denominations in the form of persecution, such as was the case with William Penn and the Church of England. Ohio's state motto does not, in any form, violate the First Amendment.

THE PINELAND COMMISSION RESPONDS TO NJM REQUEST

Dear Mr. Dickey,

Thank you for your letter requesting a copy of the Attorney General's opinion regarding resolutions submitted by the [Pine Land] Committee.

Opinions issued to the Commission by the Attorney General's Office are privileged documents in an attorney-client relationship. As such, they are not available for public dissemination.

Should you have further questions...[blah, blah, blah].

Sincerely,

Terrence D. Moore

Executive Director

Ed.: The Pinelands Commission consists of 15 appointees who rule like barons over 1 million acres and 700,000 people in parts of 7 southern N.J. counties that have been designated a United Nations International Biosphere Reserve. Individual property owners must ask permission before then can build on their own land. (Usually permission is denied; but when it is granted it is only after years--in some cases, 14 years of expensive aggravation.) Fifty-three municipalities must conform to a so-called Comprehensive Management Plan imposed on them and must seek permission from the Commission to change even a single city ordinance. Thus the people and their elected representatives are compelled to kow-tow to appointed officials accountable to no one. This is tyrannical United Nations zoning masked as environmental protection.

NJM asked the Pinelands Commission to sign resolutions in which they would agree to uphold their oaths of office to protect the people, and to permit representatives of the New Jersey Committee of Safety to sit in on their deliberations.

Interestingly, the Attorney General's opinion on the resolutions, paid for by the people, are not available to the people.

Letters

NJM,

Concerning your Oct, 97 NJM newsletter, I'm an electronic tech., a ham, and a proud owner of my own FM radio station.

I found the easiest thing to getting on the air was constructing the transmitter kit myself. The real hassle has been obtaining a program source. A good ole 8-track that would be continuously loop would have been ideal, but try and locate one of those, or tapes for it. So I've brought a Radio Shack cassette tape deck that will loop to do the job.

The next hassle is creating the program info, copying and editing the actual tape. Plus learning how to use a mixer, etc.

A hassle, but fun anyway.

D.G., Middlesex County

Editor's note: We suggest setting up a satellite dish and tune into one of the patriot stations that broadcast 24 hours a day. All patriot short-wave broadcasts are on satellite. This will save you the hassle of the 8-tracks, taping, recording and editing.

Dear NJM,

Excellent Newsletter the August issue. It's getting around Washington and Alaska.

Enclosed is my April clash with the local carpetbagger, scumbag friends of SPLC!!!

Take care,

Jim Watkins, Republic of Washington

N J M, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton, NJ 08650
Email: Militia264@aol.com
Fax: (609) ~~675-7090~~ 695-0790

Mercer Co, Earl.....(609) 989-7292
Mercer Co., Bob.....(609) 695-2733
Middlesex Co., Art.....(908) 607-0833
Passiac Co., Ken.....(201) 779-4761

(Newsletter subscription - Donation $10.00)
CASH/BLANK MONEY ORDER ONLY

NAME_____

ADDRESS_____

CITY_____

PHONE ( ) _____

The New Jersey Committee of Safety

News bulletin October 8, 1997

For immediate release

Contact Ida Anderson 609 654-8326
Earl Dickey 609 989-7292

Danger!!! Bears Being Imported into the Pinelands for Political Purposes???
Are wolves and grizzlies next???

"Is the plan to bring black bears into the Pinelands a political ploy to drive people out and impose stricter land use controls?" said Ida Anderson of Shamong Township. "When grizzlies were 're-introduced' near Libby, Montana, the Fish and Game bureaucrats said a sufficient 'gene pool' would have to be established. Thousands of acres of pine forest were then declared off limits for human use in order to preserve habitat for bears. The town was practically destroyed economically."

"There is nothing wrong with bears as such, as long as the landowner can take measures to protect his property if necessary," said Earl Dickey. "Instead landowners are subject to imprisonment and $100,000 fines. Excessive fines are prohibited by the Eighth amendment, but government has ignored constitutional protections in the past."

"Human safety must be considered too," said Anderson. "Fish and Game told parents they should put bells on their children to warn the bears whenever they went outdoors; that's how much concern they showed in Montana. We can't let them get away with that here in New Jersey. Besides there is a fanatical group of environmentalists and conservation biologists who want to return America to a pre-Columbian (pre-1492) state of nature. Bizarre as it may sound if they can find the slightest evidence that wolves and grizzlies were here 500 years ago they will undoubtedly use the Endangered Species Act to bring them into New Jersey."

"The United Nations has unilaterally declared the Pinelands an International Biosphere Reserve," added Dickey. "This designation has never been approved by the Pinelands municipalities and counties, nor the New Jersey legislature or Congress. The biosphere program is being run entirely by the United Nations and the executive branch in Washington, Trenton and New Lisbon, headquarters of the Pinelands Commission. The use of wildlife for political purposes may be an important part of their agenda. It is reported that the Chinese Communists, who recently visited the Pinelands, have de-populated parts of Tibet on the pretext of providing habitat for the giant panda."

The New Jersey Committee of Safety was founded by the Association to Preserve Individual Rights for Everyone (ASPIRE) and the New Jersey Militia. Membership is open to all.